The Riverside Division of the Academic Senate met on Tuesday, February 22, 2005, at 2:10 p.m. in the Science Library Conference Room 240. Chair Manuela Martins-Green presided.

The Minutes of the Regular meeting of the November 16, 2004, meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR: Chancellor Córdova announced that the details of the Governor’s proposed budget are available for viewing on the UCR website as a video of the open forum.

The Chancellor discussed the importance of faculty diversity. In national context, this is becoming a significant issue, particularly in the sciences and engineering. UCR missed out on a grant from the Luce Foundation because of our failure to diversify over the past several years. Specific weakness noted were:

- The percentage of women in Science and engineering has declined significantly over the past ten years
- UCR offers no sustained pre-college programs to encourage women to pursue the sciences or engineering

One of the strategic goals/vision the Chancellor has enunciated for UCR is to diversify our faculty, staff and graduate population; our vision is the UCR will be a preeminent research university that has diversity as one of its measures of distinctiveness.

Vice Provost Yolanda Moses, consultant for Excellence and Diversity, has designed a series of workshops on diversity. First is “Diversity in the Academy,” with focus on diversifying our faculty. It will be held on March 11, 2005 at UNEX. Included will be administrators, faculty, graduate students, staff and community leaders. Deans, Department Chairs and Chairs of Search Committees are encouraged to attend.

The workshop features opportunities to participate in discussion groups, out of which will be drawn recommendations. Panel members will be UCR Chancellor Cordova, National Prospective; UC Provost MRC Greenwood, UC Systemwide perspective; UC Berkeley professor Marc Goulden, UCOP Report on Flexible Tenure Track Pathways; UCR Vice Provost, Yolanda Moses, UCR’s diversity statistics.

Goals for the workshop are:

- Increased awareness. Diversity of thought
- Concrete recommendations/strategies for recruiting and retaining more diverse graduate students and faculty
- Long term Success which will reflect the diversity we enjoy at our undergraduate level. (Our faculty is growing with the growth in student enrollment and will enable us to become a national leader.)

At UCR, we have exceptional undergraduate diversity and thus the ability to encourage our own students to take up careers not being developed. Everyone is encouraged to attend the workshop and to be a role model.

The Chancellor mentioned that she is visiting all of the departments to discuss departmental issues and to learn of the needs for best practices.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR: Dr. Martins-Green thanked everyone for coming and reminded those present that immediately following the regular meeting, a faculty meeting would be held and hoped that everyone would stay for the very important discussions that would be held regarding faculty burdens and staff support. She then announced that the Academic Senate bylaws need revising because they were written a long time ago and have been outdated by growth and technology. A consultant has been hired to review the bylaws and update them as needed. They will be reviewed by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, the Advisory Committee and then presented to the full faculty for final approval.
A poll was taken regarding the need for a University Club. The results were as follows:

Do you support the idea of a new University Club:

- Faculty – 95% said yes
- Staff - 91% said yes
- Graduate Students – 87.5% said yes

Would you contribute to a fund to establish a University Club:

- Faculty – 67% said yes
- Staff – 52% said yes
- Graduate Students – 50% said yes

The most popular site suggested to build the Club was Picnic Hill. This venue cannot be funded by the state so there must be fund raising projects. There is currently a Board of the University Club which keeps it alive. They have a liquor license and they are on board with us. Presently we have a sub committee for the University Club which is co-chaired by Professors Tom Miller and Walter Clark. They are working on a preliminary concept and mechanism for funding the project.

Due to the emergency situation of Subject A, curricular review has been set aside. The results of the interim solutions have been posted on our website. Information will be used systematically to look at all the general education problems and come up with a solution to advise administration.

The Committee on Educational Policy is currently collecting data on how other campuses are conducting undergraduate program reviews and working on details for our own review process. In time, there will be curricular form but it takes time. Provost Jury is working with us to put all of the guidelines into action.

There has been a lot of work sent to the campuses from Academic Council asking for feedback from statewide committees. This will be sent to the local committees for review and recommendations and then sent back to Academic Council. A final report is presented to Academic Council and is voted on and finally sent to the administrators.

SPECIAL ORDERS:

I. Consent Calendar: The Consent Calendar was adopted with unanimous consent.

   II. Reports of Standing Committees: The Reports of the Standing Committees were adopted with unanimous consent.

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ASSEMBLY: The Fall 2004 Assembly Meeting of the Academic Senate was held on November 11, 2004 by teleconference. The UCR representations met in the Academic Senate offices in the University Office Building.

Present: Manuela Martins-Green, Harry Green, John Ganim (sitting in for Junior Assembly Representative Emory Elliott), and Mary Gauvain (Senior Assembly Representative)

The following items were discussed.

   A. Announcements by Chair Blumenthal

       There will be several major issues facing the Academic Senate this year, these are:

       1. Long-term planning for the University. Long-term planning (5, 10 and 20 years forward) is critical to the university and this year there will be many discussions systemwide and on individual campuses on this topic. A primary concern is graduate education. UC’s position in graduate education has declined recently relative to other universities in the U.S. and abroad; planning groups are focusing on how to regain our competitiveness in this arena. Related to this issue is the fact that since the events of 9/11 there has been a substantial decrease in foreign graduate students applying to or being successfully admitted to UC. This has severely affected graduate recruitment because many of our graduate students in recent years have come from abroad.
2. **Tracking Legislation.** Another critical issue is how UCOP can follow legislation pertinent to the system as it moves through the State Senate and Legislature. There has been intensive effort since last year to convince the State government of the importance of UC to the state. This effort seems to be successful and it will continue. Faculty will be increasingly involved in this effort.

3. **Restrictions on Research Funds.** Restrictions on research funds that emanate from external and internal sources will also be an important part of this year’s discussions in the Senate. UCORP has been involved in this issue and has taken the lead in writing resolutions that have been reviewed by the Academic Council. Faculty requested broader review by all the campuses, which will be conducted this year.

4. **California Institute for Science and Innovation.** The California Institute for Science and Innovation was discussed with the question of how the Academic Senate can be involved in the oversight and review of this initiative. The Office of the Provost is involved with this issue.

5. **Intersegmental issues up for Senate review**
   a. **Transfer process.** There are efforts to streamline the articulation process between community colleges and UC. A program is being devised that would allow transfer students from community colleges who know they will be transferring to UC to satisfy their general education requirements at community college. There is also a new, related proposal that will allow science students who have a large number of prerequisites they need to take before transferring to UC to take their general education classes after enrolling at UC.
   b. **By-Law Revision.** The revision of a Promotion and Tenure policy (By-Law 336) is out for review and will be considered by the Assembly this year. It is related to disciplining faculty members and it would impose a statute of limitations on when a faculty member can be disciplined. The proposal states that a violation must be disciplined within 3 years of coming to the attention of the administration.
   c. **UC Merced.** UC Merced will open in Fall 2005 with approximately 1000 students and 50-60 faculty members. It will become a division of the Assembly this year and it will present its By-Laws, which will be voted on by the Senate.

B. **Other Reports**

1. **Report by Lab Subcommittee (ACSCONL)**
   a. **Contract principles.** A statement of principles pertaining to how UC will compete for the lab contracts has been written and approved by the Academic Council. It can be found on the UCOP Website.
   b. **Faculty-lecturer-student poll.** The poll of the faculty regarding contract bids had a 26% response, with 3:1 in favor of UC competing for the two DOE National Labs. The poll of the lecturers had a 7% response and the vote was against competing for the lab contracts. The poll of the students included only undergraduates; there was an 11% response with 3:1 in favor of competing for the lab contracts.
   c. **Contract bids.** Cliff Brunk, Chair of ACSCONL, reported that DOE has put management contracts for all the National labs up for competitive bid. UC currently manages 3 of these labs and is currently preparing a bid for continued management of Lawrence Berkeley National Lab. The RFP for Los Alamos is not out yet. It is expected that this RFP will require UC to have an industrial partner in order to compete for lab management. The contract for Lawrence Livermore National Lab was recently extended. A question was asked as to how the industrial partners and UC would coordinate their work and the response was that partners from industry would be expected to coordinate with the roles and rules of UC science efforts and initiatives.

C. **Comment from President Dynes**

President Dynes joined the meeting. He had previously provided a list of discussion topics to the Assembly members, as is his practice, and his comments were used to highlight and discuss issues presented in his written comments.

1. **Budget –** For the 2005-06 budget year, the budget will be based largely on the compact with the Governor that was made by President Dynes last year. The Governor has said that he will honor the compact. It will include an increase to faculty salaries, support for merit increases, and program funds. A 5000 FTE student enrollment growth is in the budget. Fee increases for undergraduate and graduate students are proposed and the Regents have agreed to vote on these in a timely fashion so as to provide maximum notice for students.

2. **Long-term planning.** Long-term planning for UC is critical, including professional school planning, undergraduate and graduate program needs, and whether an 11th campus is needed. There will a broad range
of meetings on these issues over the next year and the key concerns are preserving the quality of the institution and reinvesting in undergraduate and graduate education. The President stated that attention to undergraduate education in recent years has been done at some cost to the graduate programs and it is important to rectify this imbalance. Related issues on the table include: whether UC should have an international face, how UC should contribute to mathematics and science education in the state, how to maximize efficiencies in the operation of the system, and how to build a reliable group of strong supporters of the university (such as faculty, students, business and professional leaders, alumni) who can go to the legislature to advocate on the university’s behalf. A committee will be formed to plan out the next step in this long-term planning process.

3. Searches. Two chancellor searches are underway: the appointment of a chancellor for UCSC went to the Regents later in the fall and was approved; a search for a chancellor for UCI will begin in early 2005.

4. Stem Cell Initiative. President Dynes expects that UC will play a big role in the implementation of this initiative

Questions from the Assembly to President Dynes:

a. Are increases to staff salaries included in the compact with the governor?
   Yes.

b. Foreign enrollments in graduate programs have declined substantially and, at the same time tuition increases have occurred, can more money be budgeted to support graduate students?
   President Dynes considers this an urgent problem because international graduate students have and will continue to be one of UC’s strengths. He is proposing a 50% return to aid, which will help with some of this expense.

c. How to reduce faculty-student ratio?
   This is addressed in the compact with money allocated to campuses for support of academic programs.

d. Are there efforts underway to increase the diversity of the faculty and students on UC campuses?
   Two areas of particular focus regarding student diversity are underway; one, put more resources and effort into academic preparation issues, and two, help change the nature of mathematics and science education in the state in the K-12 grades. In terms of faculty diversity, there are Presidential Fellowships aimed at broadening the diversity of the faculty and extra FTE have been added for hiring Presidential Fellows. There have also been changes on some of the campuses in search procedures, e.g. having the Dean’s office oversee the pool of applicants to ensure that a search is as broad as possible. A positive sign of these efforts: the number of women faculty on the campuses has been increasing.

e. Are fees for professional schools targeted to be different and higher than other academic graduate programs?
   If there are additional fees for professional schools, where will these funds go?
   Differential fees for professional schools are targeted with increases greater for professional school tuition, especially business and law schools. Increased tuition funds from professional schools will go back to the campuses and the distribution of these funds is campus specific.

f. Growth in facilities are largely funded by bonds, how facility growth on the campuses, which is direly needed, be sustained in the current economic situation in the state?
   President hopes the state will continue to support these bonds when they come up.

g. How can we contact the President’s office?
   Contact with the President via email is important, the President reads all email sent to him at Dynesdesk@ucop.edu. He also has a webpage on which his comments to the Assembly and other topics are regularly posted.

h. Is the university considering becoming a direct lender for student loans?
   The university is considering operating as a lender, though there are different views across the campuses on this issue including whether such loans should be handled systemwide or by the individual campuses.

i. How will the reelection of George Bush (which occurred just a few days before this meeting) impact UC?
   President Dynes responded that he was not sure, but of most immediate concern is that the administration’s reaction to the Stem Cell Initiative could impact Federal funding in some way.

j. Questions were asked about UC investments and how to maintain financial security, especially for retirement funds?
   President Dynes said that these funds are invested in a variety of funds and that there is an investment advisement group for these funds organized through the Regents. He said the UCOP Web Page contains the Annual Investment Report.

k. A final question asked about problems at NIH, especially funding priorities?
   The President noted that the National Academy of Science has been watching this trend carefully and that UC is represented on the Board of the Academy.
With this question, President Dynes’s comments were concluded.

**D. Two final systemwide committee reports**

1. **Committee on Faculty Welfare.** The top priority of this committee this year is faculty and staff salaries. The committee also noted that they are hoping to see the retirement plan continue as it is, but that maintenance of a contribution-free retirement plan is not likely to last forever.

2. **BOARS.** The main focus of this committee this year is the issue of eligibility in the local context in admitting students. The bottom 50% of the public schools in the state have only 3% of their students admitted to UC. The dilemma of how to identify and recruit talented students in underrepresented schools and geographic regions of the state is the main task for the committee this year.

These minutes were recorded and submitted by Mary Gauvain, Senior Assembly Representative of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate on February 22, 2005.

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND FACULTIES:** Professor H. W. Green, Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy presented and moved adoption of the following proposed changes:

A. B. A. Degree in Sociology  
B. B. S. Degree in Sociology  
C. B. A. Degree in Sociology/Administrative Studies  
D. B. S. Degree in Sociology/Administrative Studies  
E. B. A. Degree in Sociology/Law and Society  
F. B. S. Degree in Sociology/Law and Society  
G. Minor in Sociology

Each motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

**NEW BUSINESS:** A report of the Academic Council submitted by the University Committee on Research Policy: Problematic Restrictive Clauses in Contracts, Grants and Gifts for Research. There is a huge document on the website. It has been an ongoing issue since October of 2002. It came to Council in July 2004 for approval. Restrictions on research funding is not in accordance with Academic Freedom and therefore the faculty should be able to decide what they are going to accept. The Council and Assembly accepted this policy. Two campuses, UCSF and UCSD had many objections because they felt that the UC faculty as a whole were not consulted and perhaps Council did not do an extensive survey as they should have. The new Chair of the Council in 2004 decided to put it back on the agenda to be discussed by the Council if they wanted to send it back to the divisions. The consensus was to send it back to the campuses for the faculty as a whole to comment. It has been sent out to all 23 of UCR committees for their review and comments. So far the responses have been unanimous to not put restrictions on research sources. It is posted on the Senate website giving all faculty an opportunity to review it and respond to the poll that has been made available for faculty response. Everyone is encouraged to comment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

**ATTEST:**

L. Wright, Secretary-Parliamentarian  
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

Marlene Odel  
Recording Secretary